Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

No. 03 118 JUL 18 2003

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STEVE MOLNAR, PRO SE - PETITIONER

vs.

PRATT & WHITNEY, - RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

STEVE MOLNAR, PRO SE

300 TRESSER BLVD. APT 16 B

STAMFORD, CT 06901

(203) 359-2169

30pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether the appellee has articulated a nondiscriminatory reason for not hiring the appellant by observing a written company policy of "filling job vacancies from within the organization whenever possible".

2. Whether the facts will support a finding of age discriminatory motives. Is there adequate evidence to permit a reasonable finding of pretext.

a. Whether the appellee had this true intention to fill job vacancies internally, when he requested the appellant for a job interview - externally.

b. Whether the appellee's interviewing manager's request was applied equally for internal and external candidates. Mr. Kwasniewski, the senior interviewing manager stated at the start of the interview: "This is not a management trainee position, we are looking for the most experienced manager, with the most management experience".

c. Whether the appellant has made out a prima facie case. The appellant had more management experience, than the two younger candidates who were hired.

d. Whether there is any question about the 37 hires experience or qualification, when some of them were only 25 years old. Viewing the above requirement for the position their young ages alone: will this show pretext?

e. Whether the person whom the appellant initially contacted about Pratt & Whitney employment is an influential upper management employee, who asked the appellant about his age. . Was his influence crucial in the appellee's decision making?

LIST OF PARTIES

United Technologies Corp.

Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division

Defendant - Appellee

Albert Zacharian

Eric L. Sussman

Day, Berry & Howard

CityPlace I

Hartford, Connecticut 06103

Te;: (860) 275 – 0100

Attorney's for Defendant - Appellee

Michael J. Dorney, Daniel E. Livingston,

Irving H. Perlmutter, David L. Belt,

Special Masters

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 2

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 4 - 5

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 6

CONCLUSION 7

INDEX TO THE APPENDIX

APPENDIX A United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Summary Order Hon. Guido Calabresi, Hon. Fred I. Parker, Hon. Robert D. Sack. Filed: Apr 25 03 Circuit Judges

APPENDIX B United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Summary Order - Mandate Hon. Guido Calabresi, Hon. Fred I. Parker, Hon. Robert D. Sack. Issued: May 19 03

APPENDIX C United States District Court District of Connecticut Rulling on Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgement No. 3:00 CV 2488 (WWE) Warren W. Eg[illegible]ton,

Senior U. S. District Judge. Dated: March 28, 02, Entered: April 1, 02

APPENDIX D United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Appeal Number 02-7514 Appellant' s Brief on Appeal. Filed: October 14, 02 "Allied Signal Aeoro-Space" Page : A - 49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

C. C. S. Sect 46a - 60 (a) (1).
Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967

("ADEA"), 29 U. S. C. 621 et seq. Appendix C
Page / 1 – 4

See Levy v. Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, 236 Conn. 96, 103 (1996)
APPENDIX C/ page 4

OTHER

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgement below.

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A – B to the petition and is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States District court appears at Appendix C to the petition and is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was April 25, 2003

Issued as mandate on: May 19, 2003

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. & 1254 (l).

For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was March 28, 2002

The copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under 28 U.S. C. & 1257 (a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

C. G. S. Section 46 a - 60 (a) (1) and the Age Discrimination in Employment act, 29 U. S. C. 621 et seq.

When a respondent discriminate agains the complainant on the basis of his age. APPENDIX C / 1

See Levy v. Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, 236 Conn. 96, 103, (1996).

Plaintiff's federal and state law Discrimination Claims will be viewed together since the relevant federal precedent is applicable to Connecticut's atnidiscrimination law. APPENDIX C/ 4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Reference to: Question 1. On: page (i).
The appellee has not articulated a nondiscriminatory reason, for not hiring the appellant. If appellee had observed their written company policy to fill job vacancies within the organization and having plenty of internal candidates, the appellee should not request anybody externally for an interview.

2. Reference to Question 2. On: page (i).
The facts below will support the findings of age discrimination and give evidence for pretext.

a. Reference to: Question 2. a. On: page (i).
The appellee repeatedly stated that "whenever possible they will fill job vacancies internally " . The older external candidates have no chance to be hired against the substantially younger internal candidates. At that point the job experience becomes meaningless and the age factor will dominate. Similarly, the so called "interviewer's rating system" becomes biased.

b. Reference to: Question 2. b. On: page (i).
This is the greatest evidence for pretext: despite appellee's introductory statement at the job interview – "This is not a management trainee position, we are looking for the most experienced manager, with the most management experience...", the appellee fills the position with an hourly employee, who is a member of the Union, who had no management experience at all.
He received the highest scores from the interviewing managers, for whom he worked. However, he still did not meet the requirement as " the most experienced manager with the most management experience..."

c. Reference to: Question 2. c. On: page (i).
The appellant proved beyond doubt, that he has made out a prima facie case, he had the most management

experience. The position was awarded to a substantially younger candidate, who had " less management experience" as stated by the appellee. This statement is incorrect. The hired candidate had no experience at all. As a Union Member he has never been a part of the management.

d. Reference to: Question 2. d On: page (i).

The appellee's intentions were pretextual. At the end of the interview (August 24, 1999) the appellee realized how old the appellant was. Therefore the appellant was no longer considered for any position. The appellee filled 37 vacant positions with new candidates. The appellee retained the appellant's resume for one year. The vacancies were filled with young candidates . Some of them were only 25 years old.

e. Reference to: Question 2. e On: page (i).

The person, whom the appellant initially contacted - Mr. Anthony Yacoviello is an influential upper management employee of Pratt & Whitney. By his own admission in his affidavit in 1997 he was an operating manager for Prod. Center and in 2001 he became General Manager for Pratt & Whitney. Mr. Yacoviello personally assisted four of the appellant's manager colleagues to obtain management position at Pratt & Whintey (see Appendix D). These were: William Skowronski, Bob Marcho, Bruce Gardinier and Gerry Harrington.

All of them are younger than the appellant. All of them worked for Mr. Anthony Yacoviello at Allied Signal and as of today (July, 2003) they are still working for him. The appellant, Steve Molnar, who's name is also on this list could not be helped by Mr. Yacoviello, because of his age! Mr. Bob Marcho was one of the job interviewing managers (August 24, 1999). Mr. Marcho testified against the appellant at the C.H.R.O. & E.E.O.C. hearing (date filed 11/3/99)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The appellant respectfully prays to the court to grant certiorari. There are compelling reasons for the exercise of the Court's discretionary jurisdiction. As a pro se, without law degree, without the aid of an attorney, the appellant fought his way up to the highest court of the land. When the basic rights are violated, when one believes in justice, one does not walk away. Age discrimination is not an isolated incident, it is not a rare occurrence. It is happening every day. The population is getting older, people are working longer, living longer. The corporations are not in favor of the older workforce. They are getting good at replacing or not hiring a certain age group of people. There are laws to protect certain age groups, but the laws are constantly being violated.

Nationwide - the age discrimination is reaching epidemic proportions. 99% of age discrimination cases ends up and dies at the H.R.O. and at the E.E.O.C. – levels. The appellant knows, what happened to him. He is fighting for justice, but he is getting beaten by sophisticated law firms and their attorneys, on technicalities. He has a voice, he has a message for the highest court of the land. In behalf of the elderly population, we need your help. We need your voice, your action. There are literally thousands and thousands like him. But they are silent, they are hurt, they just silently walk away, they need the highest court's help. The appellant respectfully disagree with the judgement of both of the:

United States District Court District of Connecticut's and with United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit's Judgement and decision.

We need justice and understanding. We all might get old some day. The appellant is not alone, the appellant is already old.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Shobat

Date: July 18, 2003

CTDC/ BRCT
00-cv-2488
Eginton

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

SUMMARY ORDER

THIS SUMMARY ORDER WILL NOT BE PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REPORTER AND MAY NOT BE CITED AS PRECEDENTIALL AUTHORITY TO THIS OR ANY OTHER COURT, BUT MAY BE CALLED TO THE ATTENTION OF THIS OR ANY OTHER COURT IN A SUBSEQUENT STAGE OF THIS CASE, IN A RELATED CASE, OR IN ANY CASE FOR PURPOSES OF CLOLLATERAL ESTOPPEL OR RES JUDICATA.

At a stated term, of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Courthouse, Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 25 of April two thousand and three.

PRESENT:

HON. GUIDO CALABRESI,
HON. FRED I. PARKER,
HON. ROBERT D. SACK,
Circuit Judges.

Oval file stamp – in the outside circle said: " United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit", - in the inner circle said: " Filed Apr 25 2003 Roseann B. Mackechnie, Clerk".

STEVE MOLNAR
Plaintiff- Appellant,

v. No. 02-7514

PRATT & WHITNEY,
Defendant-Appellee,

MICHAEL J. DORNEY, DANIEL E. LIVINGSTON, IRVING H. PERLMUTTER, DAVID L. BELT,
Special Masters

For Plaintiff–Appellant: STEVE MOLNAR, pro se, Beacon

Falls, CT

For Defendant-Appellee: ERIC L. SUSSMAN (Albert Zakarian, on the brief), Day, Berry & Howard LLP, Hartford, CT.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (Eginton, J.).

UPON DUE CONSIDERATION, it is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the judgement of the district court be and it hereby is AFFIRMED.

Plaintiff-appellant Steve Molnar appeals, pro se, from the district court's (Eginton, J.) grant of Defendant-Appellee Pratt & Whitney's motion for summary judgement on Molnar's age-discrimination claims. These claims arise under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA"), 29 U. S. C. && 621-634, and Connecticut General Statues & 46 (a) – 60 (a)(1).[1]

DISCUSSION

We review de novo the district court's grant of summary judgment, "resolve[ing] all ambiguities and draw[ing] all factual inferences in favor of [the nonmoving party]." *Nationwide Life Ins. Co. v. Bankers Leasing Ass'n,* 182 F. 3d 157, 160 (2d Cir. 1999). ADEA claims are analyzed using the familiar *McDonnell Douglas* burden-shifting framework. *See Slattery v.*

1 In relevant part, Connecticut law follows the ADEA, *see Levy v. Comm'n on Human Rights & Opportunities,* 236 Conn. 96, 103-09 (1996), so we will assess the state and federal claims together, on the basis of federal precedent.

Swiss Reinsurance Am. Corp., 248 F. 3d 87, 91 (2d Cir. 2001). In the case before us, it is beyond doubt (a) that Appellant has made out a prima facie case, as

his application for employment was rejected in favor of two younger candidates, and (b) that appellee has articulated a nondiscriminatory reason for not hiring Appellant, namely, observance of a written company policy of "filling job vacancies from within the organization whenever possible." The question, then, is whether a rational trier of fact could conclude that Appellee's explanation was pretextual, and that the true reason that Pratt & Whitney rejected Molnar was because of his age.

Appellant proposes that the fact finder could infer discrimination from the following data. First, Molnar had more years of management experience than the candidates who were hired. Second, the person whom Molnar initially contacted about Pratt & Whitney employment inquired of Molnar's age. Third, of the 37 positions filled by Pratt & Whitney following Molnar's rejection, 82% went to candidates under 45 years of age.

These facts cannot support a finding of age-discriminatory motives. That Molnar had more years of management experience may have made him "better qualified" - in his own mind, or even objectively - than the two qualified applicants who were hired, but the company's nondiscriminatory policy was to make internal hires "whenever possible," and, unlike Molnar, the chosen applicants had many years of employment with Pratt & Whitney. Given the internal promotion policy, there can be no inference of illicit motive from the fact that Molanr was bypassed in favor of allegedly less experienced managers. Nor does the contention that a Pratt & Whitney employee asked about Molnar's age imply a suspect motive. This person was not a member of the hiring committee, and there is no evidence that he influenced the hiring process.

through other channels. Finally, one cannot infer a practice of age discrimination from the bare fact that most recent Pratt & Whitney hires were considerably younger than Molnar. One would need to know something about the applicant pool before drawing an inference of discrimination on this basis, and nothing on the record describes the pool.

We have considered appellant's remaining arguments and find them without merit.

Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.

For the Court

ROSEANN B. MACKECHINIE,
Clerk of Court

by: "s / Lucille Carr".

"APPENDIX A" / 5

MANDATE

CTDC/ BRCT
00-CV-2488
Eginton

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

SUMMARY ORDER

THIS SUMARY ORDER WILLL NOT BE PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REPORTER AND MAY NOT BE CITED AS PRECEDENTIIAL AUTHORITY TO THIS OR ANY OTHER COURT, BUT MAY BE CALLED TO THE ATTENTION OF THIS OR ANY OTHER COURT ON A SUBSEQUENT STAGE OF THIS CASE, IN A RELATED CASE, OR IN ANY CASE FOR PURPOSES OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL OR RES JUDICATA.

At a stated term of the united States Court of Appeals for the Second circuit, held at the United States Courthouse, Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 25 of April two thousand and three.

PRESENT:

HON. GUIDO CALABRESI,
HON. FRED I. PARKER,
HON. ROBERT D. SACK,
Circuit Judges.

Oval file stamp - outer circle:" United States Court of Appeals Second Circuit", inner part: " filed Apr 25 2003 Roseann B. Mackechnie, Clerk".

STEVE MOLNAR,

Plaintiff-Appelant,

v. No. 02-7514

PRATT & WHITNEY

Defendant-Appellee,

MICHAEL J. DORNEY, DANIEL E. LIVINGSOTN, IRVING H. PERLMUTTER, DAVID L. BELT,

Special Masters.

For Plaintiff-Appellant: STEVE MOLNAR, pro se,
Beacon

1

issued as mandate
May 19 2003

UNITED STATES DISCTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

STEVE MOLNAR, :
Plaintiff, :
: No. 3:00cv2488 (WWE)
:
PRATT & WHITNEY, :
Defendant. :

RULING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

In this action, plaintiff Steve Molnar complains that defendant Pratt & Whitney failed to hire him due to age discrimination in violation of the federal Age Discrimination in employment Act ("ADEA") and the Connecticut General Statues.

Defendant and plaintiff have filed cross motions for summary judgment. For the following reasons, defendant's motion for summary judgment will be granted.

Background

The parties have submitted Statements of Facts, affidavits, and exhibits, which reveal that the following facts are undisputed.

Plaintiff is a male, born on May 17, 1940, who has had managerial experience in the business of automated and manual manufacturing processes.

In 1997, plaintiff contacted Anthony Yacoviello, then Operations Manager at Pratt & Whitney, relative to potential employment at Pratt & Whitney. Mr. Yacoviello responded that plaintiff should submit a resume.

After plaintiff submitted a resume, he followed up with a phone call to Mr. Yacoviello, who informed plaintiff that he had forwarded plaintiff's resume to the appropriate people.

Diane Mallory, the manager of organizational Development and Staffing at Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation, sent plaintiff a letter, informing him that the company would review his qualifications and contact him if there was a suitable position available, and that the company would retain his resume.

In august, 1999, two positions, a Cell Leader and a Team Leader, became available. Plaintiff was requested to interview for one these positions on August 24, 1999. During his interviews with two teams of interviewers, plaintiff was not asked about his age.

Following the interviews with eight candidates, the interviewers discussed the qualifications of the candidates and assigned each one a score reflecting the extent to which the candidate exhibited the required competencies. Two individuals, Mark Muse and Scott Boulanger, tied for the highest score. Plaintiff ranked fifth. Pratt & Whitney's policy of filling vacancies from within the organization was also a consideration.

Mr. Muse and Mr. Boulanger, each of whom had worked for Pratt & Whintey for approximately twenty years, were awarded the open positions. Mr. Muse had worked as a Team Leader in another business unit for three years preceding the August, 1999 interview. Mr. Boulanger had worked as working leader for six years prior to his June, 1999 layoff from that position. Despite the layoff, Boulanger was listed on the company's recall list. Both of these individuals were 41 years old at the time,

substantially younger than the plaintiff, who was then 59

years old.

After Pratt & Whitney made its hiring decision, plaintiff filed a charge with the Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities ["CHRO"] and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ["EEOC"], alleging age discrimination. After the CHRO found no reasonable cause, plaintiff filed this action.

Discussion

A motion for a summary judgment will be granted where there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and it is clear that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U. S. 317, 322 (1986). "Only when reasonable minds could not differ as to the import of the evidence is summary judgment proper." Bryant v. Maffucci, 923 F. 2d 979, 982, (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 502 U. s. 849 (1991).

The burden is on the moving party to demonstrate the absence of any material factual issue genuinely in dispute. American International Group, Inc. v. London American International Corp., 664 F. 2d 348, 351, (2d Cir. 1981). In determining whether a genuine factual issue exists, the court must resolve all ambiguities and draw all reasonable inferences against the moving party. Anderson v. Libery Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986). If a nonmoving party has failed to make a sufficient showing on an essential element of his case with respect to which he has the burden of proof, then summary judgment is appropriate. Celotex Corp., 477 U. S. at 323. If the nonmoving party submits

evidence which is "merely colorable," legally sufficient opposition to the motion for summary judgment is not met. Anderson, 477 U. S. at 249.

Plaintiff alleges that Pratt & Whitney's decision to hire two younger individuals in lieu of him constitutes age discrimination. In support of this assertion, plaintiff maintains that (1) he was a stronger candidate than the individuals hired, (2) he was substantially older than the individuals hired, (3) 82% of the individuals hired for 37 positions between August, 1999, and August 2000, for which plaintiff claims that he was qualified, were substantially younger individuals than the plaintiff, and (4) Mr. Yacoviello allegedly inquired about plaintiff's age when plaintiff first contacted him.

Plaintiff's federal and state law discrimination claims will be reviewed together since the relevant federal precedent is applicable to Connecticut's anti-discrimination law. See Levy v. Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, 236 Conn. 96, 103 (1996).

When a plaintiff bringing a disparate treatment case is unable to establish the employer's reasons motivating the employment decision, the court must analyze the claim according to the burden shifting process established in McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green, 411 U. S. 792, 802 (1973) and Texas Dep't of Community Affairs v. Burdine, 450 U.S. 248, 252-56 (1981). To establish a prima facie claim, the plaintiff must demonstrate

that (1) he belongs to a protected class; (2) he was performing his duties satisfactorily; (3) he suffered an adverse employment action; and (4) the adverse employment action occurred under circumstances giving rise to an inference of age discrimination. Although the plaintiff's initial burden is not onerous, he must show that the adverse employment action was not based upon legitimate reasons. Thomas v. St. Francis Hospital and Medical Center, 990 F. Supp. 81, 86 (D. Conn. 1998).

If the plaintiff establishes a prima facie case, the defendant must articulate a legitimate, non-discriminatory business reason for the alleged discriminatory action. The plaintiff must then prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the supposed legitimate reason is actually a pretext for discrimination. St. Mary's Honor Center v. Hicks, 509 U. S. 502, 515 (1993).

In this instance, the Court analyzes plaintiff's claim, assuming that he has made out a prima facie case of age discrimination. However, defendant has articulated a legitimate business reason that does not constitute a pretext for discrimination.

Defendant's hiring decision was based on the interviewers' evaluation of Muse and Boulanger as the highest qualified individuals, and on Pratt & Whitney's written policy of filling job vacancies from within the organization whenever possible.

This Court is not concerned with whether defendant made the best employment decision. See Norton v. Sam's Club, 145 F. 3d

144, 119 (2d Cir. 1998), cert. denied, 525 U. S. 1001 (1998) (employers are not liable for stupid decisions). Plaintiff's subjective belief that he represented a better qualified candidate does not raise an inference of age discrimination. See O'Sullivan v. New York Times, 37 F. Supp. 2d 307, 318 (S. D. N. Y. 1999) (plaintiff's personal beliefs with respect to his qualifications were insufficient to support discrimination claim).

Even assuming plaintiff's assertion that Mr. Yacoviello inquired about his age during a phone call with the plaintiff, plaintiff's claim still fails. It is undisputed that Mr. Yacoviello was not a decision maker in the hiring decisions relevant to the plaintiff. Accordingly, this

remark lacks sufficient nexus to the challenged employment action to raise an inference of age discrimination. See e. g. Ezold v. Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen, 983 F. 2d 509, 545 (3d Cir. 1992), cert. denied, 510 U. S. 826 (1993) (Stray remarks by non-decisionmakers or by decisionmakers unrelated to the decision process are rarely given great weight....).

Plaintiff asserts that 82% of the individuals chosen for 37 different positions were younger than the plaintiff. This statistical data, however, does not raise an inference of age discrimination. Where intent is the critical issue, only a comparison between persons evaluated by the same decision-maker is probative of discrimination. Smith v. Xerox Corp., 196 F. 3d 358, 370 (2d Cir. 1999). Plaintiff offers no information about

the individuals competing for the 37 open positions, and therefore fails to account for other possible causes for the fact that younger individuals were chosen for the positions. For example, the applicant pool for these positions may have consisted only of individuals younger than the plaintiff.

Thus, after careful review, the Court finds that plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that defendant's proffered reason for its hiring decisions is pretextual for age discrimination. Accordingly, the Court will grant summary judgment in the defendant's favor.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, defendant's Motion for Summary Judgement [Doc. # 43] is GRANTED. Plaintiff's Dispositive Motion [Doc. # 42], which the Court construes as motion for summary judgment, is DENIED. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment in favor of the defendant and to close this case.

"APPENDIX C" / 6

SO ORDERED.

"s/ signature illegible

Warren W. Eginton, Senior U. S. District Judge

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut this 28th day of March 2002.

7

3:00-cv-02488

Steve Molnar cdw
205 West Road
Beacon Falls, CT 06403

AlliedSignal
AEROSPACE

Memorandum
AliedSignal Engines
Stratford, Connecticut

Date: October 25, 1995

To: All Supervision

From: Kerry O'Sullivan

Subject: Organizational Restructure

On September 29, 1995 Mike Meshay announced the consolidation of Manufacturing, Assembly and Test. To improve our focus and accountability, Operations will be restructured as follows, effective immediately.

Ed Tremblay is promoted to the position of Sr. Manager, for the Sheet Metal, Air Diffuser, Large/Small Nozzle Cells, and Inspection Services. He will be supported by the following Manufacturing Managers; Bill Skowronski, Bob Marcho, Steve Molnar, Frank Giacovelli, Marv Anderson and Bruce Gardnier. Mike Cosenza will manage Inspection Services.

Barry Ezekiel is promoted to the position of Sr. Manager for the Gear Shaft/Impeler and Housing Manufacturing Cells. He will be supported by the following Manufacturing Managers: Bert Oritz, Tom Sherwood, Larry Scholl and Bill Gibson.

Marc Braccio is promoted to the position of Sr. Manager for Recuperator Manufacturing and Special Processes. He will be supported by the following Manufacturing Managers; Brian Brennan, John Boulton'

and Gerry Harrington, Manager, Special Process.

Mark Stepanski is promoted to the position of Sr. Manager for Assembly, Balance, Tip Grind, Engine/ Component Test and Overhaul. The current management team in those areas remain the same with the exception of Kester Joseph who will share the responsibility of Assembly and Engine Maintenance in addition to the Powerplant Engineer function.

Rocky Young will assume the position of Operations Manager, off-Shift.

Ed, Barry, Marc, and Rocky will report directly to me along with Kathy Rainone who will continue to co-ordinate training activities. Please join me in supporting this Operations Management Team to successfully meet the challenges that lie ahead.